Emily Maxwell (Bar. No. 185646)
maxwelle@howrey.com
HOWREY LLP
525 Market Street, Suite 3600
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-848-4947
415-848-4999 (fax)

Eugene A. Spector (*pro hac vice*)
espector@srkw-law.com
Jeffrey J. Corrigan (*pro hac vice*)
jcorrigan@srkw-law.com
Theodore M. Lieverman (*pro hac vice*)
tlieverman@srkw-law.com
Jay S. Cohen (*pro hac vice*)
jcohen@srkw-law.com
Jonathan M. Jagher (*pro hac vice*)
jjagher@srkw-law.com
SPECTOR ROSEMAN KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C.
1818 Market Street, Suite 2500
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-496-0300
215-496-6611 (fax)
[ADDITIONAL COUNSEL ON SIGNATURE PAGE]

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DOUGLAS MEYER, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated, *Plaintiff,* vs. WALMART.COM USA LLC, WAL-MART STORES, INC. and NETFLIX, INC. *Defendants.*	Case No.: C 09-00361 BZ **NOTICE OF RELATED CASE PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 3-12 TO BE FILED IN CASE NO. CV-09-0002 (PJH); ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED, PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 7-11**

Dockets.Justia.com

Plaintiff, Douglas Meyer, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated (hereinafter "Plaintiff") hereby respectfully submit this Notice of Related Case, Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-12 and the required Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related, Pursuant to Civil L. R. 7-11.

I. APPLICABLE STANDARD UNDER CIVIL L.R. 3-12

Under Civil Local Rule 3-12, an "action is related to another when: (1) the actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event, and (2) it appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges." Civil L.R. 3-12(a).

Whenever a party knows or believes that an action may be related to an action which is or was pending in the Northern District, said party "must promptly file in the earliest-filed case an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related, pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11."[1] Civil L.R. 3-12(b). That motion must include: "(1) The title and case number of each apparently related case; (2) A brief statement of the relationship of the actions according to the criteria set forth in Civil L.R. 3-12(a)."

II. THE NEWLY FILED *SHEELER* AND *MEYER* CASES ARE RELATED TO *RESNICK* AND ITS PROGENY.

The *Resnick* case was filed in this Court on January 2, 2009. Subsequently, a number of related complaints were filed. By Order dated January 16, 2009, this Court found that the following cases are related:

(1) *Resnick, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,* C 09-0002

(2) *O'Connor v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,* C 09-0096

(3) *Endzweig v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,* C 09-00111

(4) *Schmitz v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,* C 09-00116

---

[1] "In addition to complying with Civil L.R. 7-11, a copy of the motion, together with proof of service pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-6, must be served on all known parties to each apparently related action. A Chambers copy of the motion must be lodged with the assigned Judge in each apparently related case under Civil L.R. 5-1(b)." Civil L.R. 3-12(b).

(5) *Lynch, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-00138

(6) *Groce, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al.*, C 09-00139.

By Order dated January 26, 2009, this Court found that the following cases also are related to *Resnick*:

(1) *Anthony v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-0236;

(2) *Sivek v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-00156, filed January 13, 2009; and

(3) *Faris v. Netflix, Inc., et al.*, C-09-0180, filed January 14, 2009.

After the Court's January 16, 2009 and January 26, 2009 orders, all of the above-listed cases are assigned to Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton.

In addition to the above-listed cases previously found to be related to *Resnick*, there are several new cases which also are related to *Resnick*, including:

(1) The above-captioned litigation, *Meyer v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-00361 (BZ), ("*Meyer*") filed January 27, 2009;

(2) *Sheeler v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.* C 09-274 (JL) ("*Sheeler*"), filed January 22, 2009*Meyer*; and

(3) *Slobodin v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-225 (BZ), filed January 16, 2009;

(4) *Polk-Stamps v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-244 (JCS), filed January 20, 2009.

These recently-filed cases, like the others that came before them, are related to the original *Resnick* complaint. Like the previously-related cases, these cases involve the exact same transactions and events, the identical defendants, the identical or virtually identical allegations and causes of action, and the same proposed class of plaintiffs. Accordingly, there will be unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense and there will be a risk of conflicting results if these cases are not related to *Resnick* and assigned to Judge Hamilton like the other related cases listed above.

Dated: January 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Emily Maxwell
Emily Maxwell
HOWREY LLP
525 Market Street, Suite 3600
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-848-4947
415-848-4999 (fax)

Paul Alexander
HOWREY LLP
1950 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
650-798-3500
650-798-3600 (fax)

Eugene A. Spector
Jeffrey J. Corrigan
Theodore M. Lieverman
Jay S. Cohen
Jonathan M. Jagher
SPECTOR ROSEMAN KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C.
1818 Market Street
Suite 2500
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-496-0300
215-496-6611 (fax)

Marc H. Edelson, Esq.
EDELSON & ASSOCIATES, LLC
45 West Court Street
Doylestown, PA 18901
215-230-8043
215-230-8735 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff and others similarly situated